



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

### III.—CHRONOLOGICAL STUDIES IN THE GREEK TRAGIC AND COMIC POETS.

Surprisingly little progress has been made since the first half of the present century in clearing up the dark points in the chronology of the minor Greek tragic and comic poets. This fact is at once a tribute to the epoch-making work of Clinton, Meineke, and Welcker, who all possessed in a remarkable degree the combination of wide learning and critical acumen necessary for the several important tasks to which they addressed themselves, and a testimony to the inadequate and often corrupt character of the available chronological data with which later scholars have had to be content. It is safe to say that practically all has been done that can be done in the way of new combinations of the old material, and not always to the advantage of our science. If one will but take the pains to glance at the current and the older handbooks under the names of the poets whom we propose to discuss, one will find abundant illustrations of how opinion has periodically swayed first away from the conclusions reached by the scholars above mentioned, then back again to them, the same ancient notices doing duty in either case. In the scholarly and well-balanced articles from the pens of Kaibel and Dieterich which are now appearing in the Pauly-Wissowa Encyclopädie we generally find a complete survey of all the data, and conclusions which, on the whole, are not assailable in the present state of our knowledge. If I shall take issue with any of these conclusions it will be, with possibly one exception, because of evidence which has hitherto not been applied to these questions. On any other grounds it would neither be profitable nor justifiable to attempt to reopen the discussion for the sake merely of recording a personal opinion.

The new evidence to which I allude is to be found, for the most part, in the catalogues of victorious tragic and comic poets which I discussed in a recent number of this Journal, now found together under No. 977 of the second volume of the Attic Corpus. The order in which the names occur in these catalogues was determined by the date of the first victory of each poet. If, then, we

can fix the date of any given name in the lists, we shall know within very narrow limits the dates of the first victories of the poets immediately succeeding and following, and if we can fix the date of any two names in a given list, the limits are known within which the intervening names must fall. With the information thus gained we may hope in some cases to be able to correct or correctly interpret the often vague or corrupt chronological notices found in Suidas, the hypotheses prefixed to the extant dramas, Eusebius and the other chronographers, Anonymous *περὶ κομφιδίας* II (Kaibel), the Parian Chronicle, and the statements scattered throughout Greek literature. This has not yet been attempted except in a desultory way and where the conclusions are most obvious; nor could it have been done satisfactorily, in the case of the comic poets, so long as the faulty classification given in the *Corpus* obtained. I propose to apply the new information thus derived mainly to some of the better known of the minor poets. The results which we shall reach may not always seem conclusive; it is hoped that they may at least be of value in suggesting a new line of inquiry or in giving a new point of view.

*Theodectas*.—Suidas furnishes almost all of the data which we possess concerning this poet: Θεοδέκτης Ἀριστάνδρον, Φασηλῆτης ἐκ Λυκίας, ῥήτωρ, τραπεὺς δὲ ἐπὶ τραγωδίας, μαθητὴς Πλάτωνος καὶ Ἰσοκράτους καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους. . . . ἐπὶ τῆς ρζ' (MSS ργ'; *corr.* Clinton) Ὀλυμπιάδος εἶπον (i. e. Theodectas, Naucrates, Isocrates, and Theopompus) ἐπιτάφιον ἐπὶ Μανσώλῳ. . . . δράματα δὲ ἐδίδαξε ν'. τελευτᾷ δὲ ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐτῶν α' καὶ μ', ἔτι τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ περιόντος. Welcker (*Die griech. Trag.*, p. 1070) finds a *terminus ante quem* for his death in the story of Alexander's homage to the poet's statue at Phaselis (Plut., *Alex.* 17). This was in 334/3. Since Theodectas was 41 years old at the time of his death, he must have been born as early at least as 375, probably a few years earlier. This result has been universally accepted, being consistent with the statement of Suidas that Theodectas was a pupil of Aristotle, who came to Athens in 368, and accounting for the marked respect shown by Alexander, who became the pupil of Aristotle in 343. The young prince may even have known the poet personally.

But the victors' catalogue upsets this most reasonable combination. In frag. *δ* we find [Καρκί]νος ΔΙ, [Ἄστ]υδάμας Π[ΙΙ]Ι, [Θεο]-δέκτας ΠΙΙ, [Ἀφα]ρεὺς ΙΙ. According to Vit. X Orat. 839 *d*, Aphareus began to exhibit in the archonship of Lysistratus, 368/7, and

appeared last in the archonship of Sosigenes, 342/1, winning two victories at the City Dionysia in this period. The acme of Carcinus is placed by Suidas in Ol. 100 (380-77). We learn from Diod. Sic. 5, 5 that he was often in Syracuse during the reign of the younger Dionysius (368 to 356). He must have attained a high position as a tragic poet before he was invited to Syracuse, and probably had won the larger number of his eleven victories before the accession of Dionysius II. The date of the first victory of Astydamas is fixed by the Parian Chronicle in the year 372, as we shall see later. The order of the names Carcinus, Astydamas, and Aphareus is therefore entirely in harmony with the chronological data. If we should assume an interval of three years between each of these four names—and certainly this is a liberal estimate—we should have as approximate dates of the first victories: Carcinus, ca. 376; Astydamas, 372; Theodectas, ca. 368; Aphareus, ca. 362. Since the acme of Carcinus is given as 380-77, it is more probable that his first victory was won before 376 than that Theodectas won later than 368. However, in order to keep as near to Suidas as possible, let us set the first victory of Theodectas forward to 365, though so long an interval is intrinsically improbable.

Theodectas produced 50 tragedies—that is, took part in more than 16 contests. That he devoted himself more especially to the City Dionysia is a fair inference from the fact that seven of his eight victories (Epigram apud Steph. Byz., s. v. Φασηλῆς) were won at this festival. By all accounts he had gained an enviable reputation as a rhetor before he turned his attention to tragedy. His talents must have been recognized at an early age. And yet he could hardly have entered upon his career as a poet before the age of 25. To assume a later date would make it necessary to crowd more than three tragedies into each year. Accepting this age for his first appearance at the Dionysia, and assuming that he was victorious in his first competition, his death would fall ca. 350. If he was not successful at once, his death must be placed still earlier—a supposition that is excluded by the fact of his participation in the Mausolus competition in 351. On the other hand, even if nine years elapsed between the first victory of Astydamas and that of Theodectas, and even if the latter took up tragic poetry before the age of 25, his death could not be placed more than a few years after 350. At the closest possible estimate he died from 10 to 15 years earlier than was assumed in Welcker's combination.

The year of Theodectas' birth was accordingly not far from 390. He may well have been a pupil of Plato and Isocrates, but he must have been the friend rather than the disciple of Aristotle, who was several years his junior, and not some ten years his senior, as one has supposed hitherto. In this connection it is significant that the Vit. X Orat. (837 c) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Isaeus, sub fin.) both report that the poet was a pupil of Isocrates, but say nothing of Aristotle. It is evident that Suidas or his source was tempted to bring together the great trio. Theodectas was not a youth of 24 when invited to do honor to the memory of Mausolus in 351, but a mature and accomplished man of 40, whose reputation was firmly established. Alexander could not have known him personally,<sup>1</sup> but learned to esteem the man and his works through the poet's friend and collaborator, Aristotle. This is the meaning of ὁμιλία in Plutarch's reference to Alexander's act of homage: οὐκ ἄχαριν ἐν παιδιᾷ τιμὴν ἀποδιδούς τῇ γενομένη δι' Ἀριστοτέλην καὶ φιλοσοφίαν ὁμιλία πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα.

*Astydamas, father and son.*—Since the date which we have been able to reach for the first victory of Theodectas depends somewhat upon our interpretation of the notice in the Parian Marble for the year 372, it may be well to state here the reasons which oblige us to assume that this chronicle records only first victories. It contains six notices of dramatic victories in a form sufficiently complete to be of service. In three of these the phrase is *πρῶτον ἐνίκησεν*—Aeschylus in 484, Euripides in 441, and Menander in 315 (new frag., Ath. Mitth. 1897, p. 187). The victory of Sophocles in 468 we know from Plutarch, Cimon 8, to have been his first victory, won at the City Dionysia. Philemon is set down as victorious in 327; he could scarcely have won before this date, and we know that his first Lenaeon victory was not gained for some years afterward. The omission of *πρῶτον* in the case of Astydamas consequently signifies nothing. When, now, in the catalogue of victors at the City Dionysia we find that a poet Astydamas won his first victory between 376 and 362—and both of these dates, though approximate, are derived from evidence independent of the inscription—the conclusion is irresistible that the victory of Astydamas in 372 was his first victory—indeed, his first City victory—determining the position of his

<sup>1</sup> Pseudo-Callisthenes 3, 17, the only author who asserts the contrary, will not, of course, be accepted as a witness in the matter.

name in the victors' list. Thus what was only a shrewd conjecture of Clinton must now be recognized as a demonstrated fact.

We are now confronted by the difficult problems arising out of the notices relative to the elder and the younger Astydamas. According to Suidas, the elder poet, son of Morsimus, wrote 240 plays and won 15 victories. A pupil of Isocrates, he afterwards turned his attention to tragedy. Of the younger poet Suidas mentions the titles of eight plays, giving no details concerning his career. Diodorus Sic. 14, 43, gives this notice about the elder Astydamas: Ἀστυδάμας ὁ τραγωδογράφος τότε πρῶτον (archonship of Aristocrates, 399/8) ἐδίδαξεν,<sup>1</sup> ἔζησε δὲ ἔτη ἐξήκοντα. So far there is nothing to excite suspicion except the statement of Suidas that the elder Astydamas was a pupil of Isocrates. This is clearly impossible if the date furnished by Diodorus is correct.

But another set of notices introduces some grave contradictions with this evidence. Suidas, Photius, Zenobius, and Schol. Liban., Epist. 317, p. 153, assign the Parthenopaeus (which is not among the eight plays of the younger poet enumerated in Suidas) to the elder Astydamas, son of Morsimus.<sup>2</sup> They explain the origin of the well-known proverb *σαντὴν ἐπαινέεις*, relating the story of the self-laudatory inscription composed by the poet for the basis of the statue voted in his honor after the performance of the Parthenopaeus. So long as the date of this play was unknown, there was nothing improbable in its attribution to Astydamas the father. But the programme of the tragic contest at the Dionysia of the year 340 (CIA. II 973) mentions the Parthenopaeus as one of the two plays of the victor, Astydamas.<sup>3</sup>

If Diodorus is right, the elder poet died ca. 358. We now have two difficulties in the tradition, assuming that the account of Diodorus is trustworthy: 1) the mistake of making the elder poet a pupil of Isocrates, and 2) the contradiction involved in ascribing the Parthenopaeus to him.

<sup>1</sup> Chandler used this notice for the restoration of Mar. Par., II. 80 f.: ἀφ' οὗ Ἀ[στυδάμας πρῶτον ἐδίδαξεν] Ἀθήνησαν . . . ἀρχοντας Ἀθήνησαν Ἀριστοκράτους. But the first two letters of the name are given as either AI or AII, so that no weight can be attached to this conjecture.

<sup>2</sup> Suidas, s. v. *σαντὴν ἐπαινέεις*; Photius, II 143, the same, word for word, as in Suidas; Zenobius 5, 100, the same story cast into a slightly different form. See Prager, *Insc. Metric.* 158, for the numerous allusions to the proverb. Dörpfeld, *Gr. Theat.*, p. 70, is wrong in thinking that the inscription proposed by the poet was actually inscribed on the monument.

<sup>3</sup> By an oversight, Dieterich gives the date as 368.

Susemihl, who has discussed this question most recently (Rhein. Mus. 49, 1894, p. 473), attaches great importance to the statement of Suidas about Isocrates. He sees that both difficulties can be removed if we but assume that Diodorus is in error, rather than Suidas, as has been generally believed.<sup>1</sup> The source of all the trouble, he holds, is in the date of the poet's first appearance, which ought to be the date of his birth. If he was *born* in 398, his first victory would be that of 372, and his death would fall in 338. In support of this theory he urges first the great improbability that the elder Astydamos, beginning his career in 398, did not achieve a victory until 372, and crowded the rest of his 15 victories into the next 14 years; and secondly the fact that the solution he adopts involves only one error in the tradition, while every other proposal involves at least two. As to the first of these two arguments, no answer is needed. If the statement of Diodorus is correct, then the victory of 372 must be assigned to the second Astydamos, not to the first, as we have shown. In the second place, the method followed by Susemihl, of adopting the solution that involves the smaller number of corrections in the tradition, is not sound, especially when Suidas is one of our authorities as over against Diodorus. It is better to assume a dozen errors in the former for which we can give a good explanation than one in the latter for which we can not account. Before attempting a simpler method of solving the problem, one word about the ancestors of the elder Astydamos. Philocles, his grandfather, was a nephew of Aeschylus. He was a mature man and an experienced poet in the thirties, when he defeated Sophocles and the Oedipus. His son Morsimus, the father of Astydamos, was held up to ridicule by Aristophanes as early as 424 (Eq. 401). Susemihl admits that, on his hypothesis, he would have been over fifty at the birth of his son, but cheerfully adds: "so etwas kommt ja alle Tage vor." But he was more likely sixty years old in 398, and ten years nearer the record held by Abraham and Masinissa (Appian Pun. 105). So this theory is not without its difficulties even after we have disposed of Diodorus.

We have seen that in the catalogue of victors the name of Astydamos is associated with those of two disciples of Isocrates—Theodectas and Aphareus. The victor of 372, it can hardly be doubted, was also the rhetor-poet of Suidas' first notice. The author of the Parthenopaeus was the more celebrated Astydamos,

<sup>1</sup> See the article of Susemihl for the literature on the question.

whose victories numbered 15. So far we are in agreement with Susemihl. Now I think that it can be shown that the elder Astydamos, even if he lived until 338, was probably not the poet of the Parthenopaeus. The story of the laudatory inscription proposed by the poet for himself implies that he was alive when the basis was ready to be inscribed and set up. A part of this basis has been found in the theatre (CIA. II 1363). It was incorporated in the western supporting wall of the auditorium, being so cut as to form the end toward the orchestra (Dörpfeld, *Gr. Theat.*, pp. 38, 71). This portion of the theatre was therefore not completed when the Parthenopaeus was performed. The half-finished building was taken in charge by Lycurgus, whose administration of the finances began in 338, and was pushed to completion in the ensuing years. But possibly, it may be urged, the aged Astydamos submitted his verses while on his death-bed. This too is improbable, for the proverb *σαντήν ἐπαινείς* seems to have been coined, or at least put in a popular form, by Philemon, who did not begin his career as a poet until the end of the thirties. Now, the line *σαντήν ἐπαινείς, ὥσπερ Ἀστυδάμας, γύναι* (fr. 190, Kock) would have had distinctly more point and would have been much more likely to raise a laugh if the poet were alive and in the audience, than if he had only a few years before been borne to his grave covered with honors and universally lamented—the last great poet of the line of Aeschylus. These considerations are not advanced as proof, but as lending somewhat greater improbability to an hypothesis which is in itself distinctly improbable.

If, on the other hand, the younger Astydamos was the author of the Parthenopaeus, then not simply the single statement of Suidas concerning Isocrates is wrong, but all of the latter part of the notice. Here lies the solution. The facts that refer to the son have been transferred, by a simple error of transmission, such as abound in Suidas, to the father. The biographical notices should therefore read:

1) Ἀστυδάμας, υἱὸς Μορσίμου τοῦ Φιλοκλέους, τραγικῶν ἀμφοτέρων, Ἀθηναῖος τραγικός.

2) Ἀστυδάμας ὁ νέος, υἱὸς τοῦ προτέρου, τραγικὸς καὶ αὐτός. δράματα αὐτοῦ . . . <ἔγραψε τραγωδίας σμ' (?), ἐνίκησε ιε'. ἀκροασάμενος δὲ ἦν Ἰσοκράτους, καὶ ἐτράπη ἐπὶ τραγωδίαν.>

The error in the notices about the Parthenopaeus may have been due to the confusion of the names—that is, to an error of



ignorance—but it was more likely due, as it seems to me, to haplography. The notice in Suidas and Photius may have read originally: 'Αστυδάμαντι τῷ <'Αστυδάμαντος τοῦ> Μορσίμου εὐήμερ-  
σαντι ἐπὶ τραγῳδίας διδασκαλίᾳ Παρθενοπαίου δοθῆναι ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων εἰκόνας  
ἀνάθεσιν ἐν θεάτρῳ. We have assumed two errors in the tradition, it is true, but they were palaeographical errors of a common type; Susemihl made shift with one, but one the correction of which as proposed involves not inconsiderable improbabilities in connection with both the birth and the death of the elder Astydamos, and one which in itself is most difficult to account for.

*The Two Apollodori.*—Suidas has the following articles on the comic poets Apollodorus, a notice on the grammarian Apollodorus intervening:

1) 'Απολλόδωρος, Ἀθηναῖος κωμικός. ἐποίησε δράματα μζ', ἐνίκησε ε'.

2) 'Απολλόδωρος, Γελῶος, κωμικός. σύγχρονος τοῦ κωμικοῦ Μενάνδρου.  
δράματα αὐτοῦ . . . (seven titles follow).

An Apollodorus of Carystus is frequently quoted. Before Meineke it was generally believed that there were three comic poets of this name. But, since Suidas does not mention the Carystian, and the Athenian is mentioned by no one but Suidas, Meineke (*Hist. Crit.*, p. 462) identified the latter with the former. This opinion has prevailed hitherto. Kaibel, however (*Pauly-Wissowa Encycl.*, s. v. Apollodorus), now identifies all three.<sup>1</sup> He notes that the articles in Suidas supplement each other, and accordingly concludes that they originally formed a whole, now separated by the misplaced article on the grammarian Apollodorus. He advances the following considerations in support of his view: 1) Two plays included in the list given in Suidas for the Geloan, the *Γραμματεῖδιοποιός* and the *Ἰέρεια*, are cited under the name of the Carystian also. 2) Other plays, not in the list, are referred to under both names and by the simple name of Apollodorus. The latter is most usual. 3) In the didascalia of the Phormio and in the commentary of Donatus, in *Aul. Gell.* 2, 23, Anon. *περὶ κωμ.* II (Kaib.), and the list of victors, *CIA.* II 977 g, only one poet of the name is mentioned and no distinguishing epithet is employed. 4) The style of the Geloan and Carystian (and Athenian) is identical.

There are two obvious objections to this view, both of which Kaibel anticipates. In the first place, the existence of the epithets

<sup>1</sup> Meineke, l. c., quotes the opinion of Kuhn to the same effect, with the comment: "nihil habet quo commendetur."

'Αθηναίος, Γελῶος, and Καρύστιος must be accounted for. But citizenship was very freely bestowed at that time, and Apollodorus may well have been thus honored by two cities besides his own. A more serious matter is that of date. Suidas, as we have seen, calls the Geloan a contemporary of Menander. But this, according to Kaibel, was but another way of saying that he belonged to the New Comedy. So Diphilos in Anonymous (κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον ἐδίδαξε Μενάνδρῳ), and Lynceus in Suidas (σύγχρονος γέγονεν Μενάνδρου τοῦ κωμικοῦ), and Poseidippus in Suidas (τρίτῳ ἔτει μετὰ τὸ τελευτῆσαι τὸν Μένανδρον διδάξας) are all dated in terms of Menander. As for the date of the Carystian derived from Athenaeus 14, 664 a, Kaibel holds that the language implies similarity rather than contemporaneousness.

It must be acknowledged that these arguments, if taken at their face value, make a strong case for Kaibel's contention. But I am convinced that they do not bear examination. After all, the only positive argument is that based on the style of the fragments; the rest tend to show no more than the possibility, or, if you please, the probability, of the proposed identification. But can even so expert a critic of style as Kaibel set up such a claim on the basis of the extant remains? Less than ten verses are assigned by Kock<sup>1</sup> to the Geloan, and among them only one complete sentence. Some forty-five verses are given to the Carystian. A large proportion of all the fragments is quoted in illustration of uncommon words. In such a collection it would not be strange if one found a certain uniformity of style, if we can use the word 'style' at all. The third of Kaibel's arguments would have weight if in the passages cited we had any right to demand the names of both Apollodori, with their appropriate designations. On the contrary, the Anonymous writer expressly states that he gives only the ἀξιολογώτατοι of the New Comedy. Nobody has claimed such an honor for Apollodorus Gelous. As for the epithet, Philemon is in no way distinguished from the two other comic poets of this name, and yet nobody is deceived. The official lists of victors never distinguish between homonyms. The portion of the Lenaeon list to which Kaibel refers could not

<sup>1</sup> Kock's treatment of the two Apollodori is very unsatisfactory. For example, he assigns two fragments of the Γραμ. to the Geloan, the third to the Carystian, according as they chanced to be quoted. But even if we transfer the odd fragment to the Geloan, we remove practically the only fragment of which 'style' might be predicated from the remains of the Carystian.

have embraced the name of the second Apollodorus, supposing that there was such a person, unless his first victory was won within about 15 years after that of the first of the name. The fact that only one Apollodorus appears in this list is, consequently, of no significance to those who believe that the Carystian was a generation later than the Geloan. The passage of Aulus Gellius runs: *comoedias lectitamus nostrorum poetarum sumptas ac uersas de Graecis, Menandro ac Posidippo aut Apollodoro aut Alexidi, et quibusdam item aliis comicis.* In such a selection I fail to see why we should expect to find both Apollodori. Nor can an inference, in my opinion, be drawn from the fact that here and in the *didascalia* to the *Phormio* there is no attempt to distinguish this Apollodorus from another of the same name. To the Romans there was ordinarily only one Apollodorus, as there was but one *Philemon*. The learned *Life of Terence*<sup>1</sup> published by Mai furnishes the only exception.

Nor does Kaibel's answer to the two obvious objections to his theory seem quite convincing. Assume that a poet from Carystus was admitted to citizenship at Athens and was made an honorary citizen of Gela also. He might well be referred to indifferently either as an Athenian or as a Carystian, and possibly as a Geloan by the Geloans; but surely the Athenians, or the ancient writers whose sources were all Athenian, would never have spoken of him as 'the Geloan.'<sup>2</sup> The fact that in such writers we find both epithets in current usage points distinctly to two different indi-

<sup>1</sup> *Quattuor e Menandro translatae . . . , duae ex Apollodoro Caricio, Hecyra et Phormio.*

<sup>2</sup> If he resided permanently in Athens and had received the citizenship, he would call himself by preference an Athenian, and would be so called officially, but outside of Athens he would generally be designated by his native city. At least this seems to be a safe inference from a number of examples which I have collected. The following instances of comic poets may be cited. The elder *Philemon* was from Syracuse and is called a Syracusan by *Suidas* and *Anon. περὶ κωμ.*, and in the inscription *CIG.*, *Sic. et Ital.* 1221. But in the official inscriptions *CIA.* II 1289 and III 948 he is given his deme name *Διομενίδης*. So *Diodorus* from *Synope* is called *Συνωπεύς* in the *Delian inscriptions* *B. C. H.* 2, pp. 104, 106, but on his tombstone, *CIA.* II 3343, is designated by his deme *Σημαχίδαι*. The comic poet *Diomedes*, whose statue was set up in the theatre (*CIA.* III 952), is found in an inscription from *Magnesia* on the *Meander* (*Ath. Mitth.* 19, p. 96) as Δ. 'Αθηνοδόρου Περγαμηνός; but in a dedication in his honor found at *Epidauros* ('*Εφ. 'Αρχ.* 1883, p. 27) we have Δ. 'Αθηνοδόρου 'Αθηναίος. In an Athenian inscription *CIA.* III 769, *Καπίτων* is described as a ποιητής Περγαμηνός καὶ 'Αθηναῖος. Examples could be multiplied.

viduals. Finally, let us see how the case really stands regarding the dates which Meineke believed he established. The language of Athenaeus (Μάχων δ' ὁ Σικυνώνιος τῶν κατὰ Ἀπολλόδωρον τὸν Καρύστιον κωμικοποιῶν εἰς ἐστὶ καὶ αὐτός), to my thinking, clearly implies that Machon, who was the instructor of Aristophanes of Byzantium in matters pertaining to comedy (Ath. 6, 241 f.), was a contemporary of Apollodorus Carystius. But opinions may differ on this point. But surely the phrase σύγχρονος τοῦ Μενάνδρου is more than an indefinite reference to the time of the New Comedy. Let us see if Diphilus, Lynceus, and Poseidippus, who are also dated by reference to Menander, are really illustrations of Kaibel's contention. For Diphilus we have the testimony of Philemon himself in the words of Tranio, in Plautus, Mostell. 1149 si amicus Deiphilo aut Philemoni's. In the list of victors, frag. g, Diphilus is in the third place after Menander and second after Philemon. The language of Anonymous is therefore about as exact and definite as it could be. Lynceus was the brother of the historian Duris and pupil of Theophrastus. He was thus, in fact, Menander's contemporary, and we may accept the other explicit statement of Suidas, that he once defeated his great rival. Poseidippus is said to have exhibited first two years after Menander's death. We can not control this statement to the year, but can show that Suidas was not far wrong, at any rate. Poseidippus undoubtedly won a Lenaeon victory. But on frag. g of the Lenaeon list of victors, which includes eight names after Menander, his name is not found. This represents an interval of about 18 years—the *minimum* of time which may have elapsed between the first victory of Menander, which was not before 321, and the first victory of Poseidippus. When we consider that so precise a notice as this of Suidas probably was based upon the official didascalic records, it would seem that it has been needlessly suspected. I may add that the other notices of this character in Anonymous and in Suidas—that is, those which fix the time of a poet by reference to a contemporary—are found to be surprisingly accurate when tested by what remains of the victors' lists.<sup>1</sup>

After all that has been said to weaken the force of Kaibel's arguments, I should feel that the principal argument for the identification of the Apollodori—that is, the deliberate opinion of this

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Eupolis in Anon., and Theopompus, Plato, Nicophon, and Nicocharēs in Suidas. Aristophanes, to whom these last-named poets are referred, had a long career, so that σύγχρονος is in his case a sufficiently broad term.

distinguished scholar—were still unimpaired, unless we should succeed in producing new evidence on the other side. It must be made clear that the Carystian was of a later date than the Geloan, and that without the aid of the passage in Athenaeus concerning Machon. That there was an Apollodorus σύγχρονος τοῦ Μενάνδρου is established by the victors' list, CIA. II 977 g—Μένανδρος, Φιλίμων, Ἀπολλόδωρος, Δίφιλος, Φιλίππιδης, κτέ. That there was also an Apollodorus in the next generation, a contemporary of Poseidippus, is an equally certain inference, in my opinion, from the list of the principal poets of the New Comedy given by Anonymous: Philemon, Menander, Diphilus, Philippides, Poseidippus, Apollodorus. In its enumeration of the poets of the Old Comedy, this valuable article follows a strictly chronological order. The same holds true of the present enumeration, unless Apollodorus alone forms an exception, for every name after the two first can be checked off against the names in the official victors' list, so far as it goes. Were this list the record of the Dionysia, and not of the Lenaea, the two first would also be found in the order given in Anonymous. I see no way of explaining the position of Apollodorus *after* Poseidippus except by going back to the old belief in Apollodorus of Carystus as distinct from Apollodorus of Gela. The chronological data furnished by the ancients are in harmony in every particular with the order of names here given. Apollodorus of Gela, the contemporary of Menander in the victors' list, has no place in the select list of ἀξιολογώτατοι in Anonymous. Completely overshadowed as a poet by the younger man, he well-nigh loses his place in the history of literature as well, for the simple name 'Apollodorus' is understood by everybody to mean the Carystian. To identify these two poets creates difficulties where no contradictions existed before, and does violence to some very explicit and apparently trustworthy statements of the ancients, as well as to the testimony, unconscious and therefore less open to suspicion, of Anonymous περὶ κωμωδίας and the victors' list.

The task of assigning the extant fragments to their right authors is no less difficult than before, but it would be easy to improve upon Kock. In the first place, it is *a priori* probable that every play ascribed to the Geloan belongs to him. The plays of the famous Carystian are less likely to have been ascribed to his less-popular and less-known double. Other considerations support this view in the case of two plays. Wilamowitz has shown (Ind.

lect. Gött. 1893/4, p. 14—quoted by Kaibel) that the *Γραμματεῖ-διοποιοῖς*, which is in the list of Suidas and attributed to the Geloan twice by Pollux, though to the Carystian by Athenaeus, was written before 300. There is also internal evidence for as early a date for the *ἑρπεια*, also in the list of Suidas, but referred to the Carystian by Athenaeus. To the younger poet may be assigned, on the other hand, all plays that are quoted by the unqualified name 'Apollodorus,' and also the *Ἐκυρα* and *Ἐπιδικαζόμενος*, on the authority of the *Vita Terentii*.

*Cephisodotus and Cephisodorus.*—In the Lenaeon list of victors, at the foot of the third extant column and in the ninth place before Menander, stands the name [*Κηφισόδω*]ρος I. Though only three letters remain, the restoration proposed by Köhler may be accepted as certain, giving as it does the name of a well-known comic poet that satisfies perfectly the conditions of space. The date of the single victory of this poet can not be far from 345. Now, the Cephisodorus whom we have known hitherto has been universally assigned to the Old Comedy. A comic poet of this name, according to the vulgate text of Lysias 21, 4, won a victory in the archonship of Euclid. At this time the practice of appointing two men to bear the burdens of the choregia together was followed for the tragic and comic exhibitions at the City Dionysia (Aristotle apud Schol. Arist., Ran. 404). But the speaker in Lysias gives us to understand that he alone met the expenses at the occasion referred to (*κωμωδοῖς χορηγῶν Κηφισοδώρῳ ἐνίκων, καὶ ἀνήλωσα σὺν τῇ σκευῇ ἀναθέσει ἑκκαίδεκα μνᾶς*). Hence it is believed that the victory of the poet of 402 was won at the Lenaea.<sup>1</sup> We should accordingly expect to find the name of this poet in col. II of the list before us. But, unfortunately, the last six names in this column are lost. In the corresponding portion of the list of victors at the Dionysia (frag. k, 3d l. of col. III), however, we find the name of [*Κη*]φισο-. Between this name and that of Euphronius in col. I (frag. i), 26 or 27 names intervened on the original stone. Since Euphronius won his single victory in 458 (CIA. II 971 f.), the first victory of *Κηφισο-* was won in the neighborhood of 400. There can be no doubt, therefore, of the identity of this poet and the victor of 402 in Lysias. It is equally certain that the *Κηφισόδωρος* of col. III is an entirely different

<sup>1</sup> See article on the Synchoregia in Am. Journ. Phil. 17 (1896), p. 322, and Haigh, Attic Theatre<sup>2</sup>, p. 75.

person. We have therefore a new name to add to our *index poetarum*.

How, then, shall we restore the name in frag. *ℓ*? The manuscripts of Lysias all give Κηφισοδότῳ. This has been changed by common consent with Clinton (Fast. Hell. under year 403/2) to -δότῳ, for the sake of identifying this poet with the Cephisodorus known from Suidas and over a dozen citations in other authors. But, now that we have found a poet Cephisodorus who is not identical with the poet in Lysias, the original presumption in favor of the change absolutely disappears, and we should unhesitatingly restore the reading of the manuscripts in Lysias and the name [Κη]φισό[δοτος] in the inscription.

But we have still to reckon with Suidas, whose notice is as follows: Κηφισόδωρος Ἀθηναῖος, τραγικός τῆς ἀρχαίας τραγωδίας. ἔστιν αὐτοῦ τῶν δραμάτων Ἀντιλαῖς Ἀμαζόνες Τρωφώνιος Ὑς. The article is clearly corrupt. The titles are all comic, and the necessity of correcting τραγικός and τραγωδίας to κωμικός and κωμωδίας is obvious. But even so the Cephisodorus whom we know from frag. *g* of the victors' list did not belong to the Old Comedy, and the poet of the Old Comedy of frag. *ℓ* was not necessarily, as we have seen, Cephisodorus. It may, after all, be necessary to adopt the textual change in Lysias. But there is a simpler way of accounting for the error. Preceding the notice in Suidas which we have quoted is an article on Κηφισόδοτος, a general. If we suppose that in the source or in the original form of Suidas this article was followed by an article on Κηφισόδοτος, κωμικός τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας, and this by the present article on Κηφισόδωρος, who was, however, characterized as κωμικός τῆς μέσης κωμωδίας, nothing could be more natural than that the transcriber's eye passed over the second Κηφισόδοτος to Κηφισόδωρος, then back to the description τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμ., and possibly confounded the titles of the plays of the two poets also. This kind of error is found all through Suidas. As for the confusion of τραγικός and κωμικός, see the examples cited by Meineke in Hist. Crit., pp. 340, 521 sqq.

All of the extant fragments are quoted under the name of Cephisodorus; they should therefore be assigned to the poet of the Middle Comedy. Among the titles of the plays thus quoted are the last three mentioned by Suidas. There is nothing either in the scanty fragments or in the allusions of Athenaeus and Pollux which indicates a date, and the titles are such as we find in the Middle Comedy. On the other hand, the first play men-

tioned in Suidas, Ἀντιλαΐς, is never quoted. Meineke (Hist. Crit., pp. 414 and 267) pointed out that the title has reference to Lais, the famous ἑταῖρα of the last part of the fifth century and the beginning of the fourth. Epicrates, who flourished in the early part of the fourth century, also wrote a comedy with this title. One might suspect, therefore, that this play at least was produced by Cephisodotus. Its omission from the list of titles in Eudocia (p. 443, Flach), otherwise identical with that in Suidas, may have been due to the textual history of the notice which has been suggested. The indications are too slight, however, for any positive conclusions. In any event, the plays of Cephisodotus were probably not extant at the time of the Alexandrian grammarians.

*Aristomenes.*—The notice of Suidas is: Ἀριστομένης, Ἀθηναῖος, κωμικὸς τῶν ἐπιδευτέρων τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμῳδίας, οἱ ἦσαν ἐπὶ τῶν Πελοποννησιακῶν, Ὀλυμπιάδων πζ'. The dating is consistent with itself, for Phrynichus is also classed among the ἐπιδεύτεροι, and made his first appearance in 431. A poet of this name appears as a competitor of Aristophanes in 387; hence the statement which we find in the Pauly-Wissowa Encyclopädie, that Aristomenes was "durchaus Zeit- und Altersgenossen des Aristophanes."<sup>1</sup> This would give a career of 44 years. Meineke (op. cit., p. 211) thinks this improbable, suggesting that the didascalical notice prefixed to the *Plutus* is a blending of two such records, one referring to the first production of the *Plutus* in 408, in which the name of Aristomenes appeared, the other to the second performance. Kock (vol. I, p. 690) quotes this opinion with approval, although he should know—in Meineke's time it was not known—that the presence of five names in the didascalia of the *Plutus*, as opposed to the three found in earlier notices, is simply an indication that the number of competing plays had been increased from three to five. It must be accepted, then, as an established fact that Aristomenes, or a poet of similar name, competed as late as 387.

The catalogue of Lenaeon victors makes it certain that the first appearance of this poet was several years before 431, and that

<sup>1</sup>He is also credited with two victories each at the Dionysia and at the Lenaea. But CIA. II 977 a', which contains the name Aristomenes, can not belong to the list of comic poets. Even if it did, there would be a century between. See my article on these catalogues in the last number of this Journal.



this date in Suidas is to be considered rather his acme, or of his first victory at the Dionysia. The name of Aristomenes is in the sixth place above that of Eupolis. We do not know precisely the year of the latter's first Lenaeon victory, but it must have been before that of Aristophanes, who was victorious with the Acharnians at the Lenaea of 425. Cratinus died ca. 422, so that his second and third victories must be placed somewhere before that date. Now the year 424 is also occupied by a victory of Aristophanes (Knights). If, then, we suppose that the six poets between Aristophanes and Aristomenes won only once each before 423, and that the predecessors of the latter won no victories in the interval, the latest possible date of the first victory of Aristomenes is 434.<sup>1</sup> Obviously, this calculation leaves too little margin for the extra victories of the earlier poets. Let us take another starting-point, the victory of Cephisodotus in 402. His name must have stood in the second place after Philonicus in col. II. Aristomenes was the twenty-fifth name preceding. We are safe in assuming that before 402 Telecleides had won all of his five victories, Cratinus three, Pherecrates two, Phrynichus probably two, Eupolis three,—occupying in all ten extra years. To these ten we may add two<sup>2</sup> victories for Aristophanes after his first (Eq. in 424, Ran. in 405): Allowing but one victory in this period to the other poets between Aristomenes and Cephisodotus, and none to the predecessors of the former, the first Lenaeon victory of Aristomenes is carried back to 439 at the latest, i. e.  $25 + 12 + 402$ . When we consider the victories of the predecessors of Aristomenes in this interval, we are certainly safe in placing his first victory not far from 445, to say nothing of his first appearance.

This being so, are we to believe that this Aristomenes is the same poet who competed with Aristophanes in 387? Since there is not a vestige of testimony to the existence of two comic poets

<sup>1</sup> Aristomenes being the seventh name before Aristophanes (425) and Cratinus winning twice in the interval. This assumes that the name of Aristophanes came immediately after Eupolis. I believe that it did, but possibly one or two names intervened.

<sup>2</sup> I omit the possible victory with the Wasps in 423, which rests upon a very uncertain revision of the corrupt didascalic notice. When we consider the large number of poets that must be crowded into the interval between Aristophanes and Cephisodotus, it seems more than ever probable that Philonides was victor in 423 with the *Προαγών*.

of this name, opinions will vary in this matter. Bergk,<sup>1</sup> although he did not know that the difference between the date given by Suidas and that indicated by the inscription was as great as we have shown it to be, concluded that there were two poets, one the contemporary of Cratinus, the other of Aristophanes. A dramatic career of over 60 years is not unexampled on the Attic stage: witness Sophocles, Alexis, and Philemon. Perhaps the strangest thing is that we should have heard so little about a man so remarkable, and that he should have had so little success. The most plausible solution, in my opinion, would be to correct *Ἀριστομένης* in the hypothesis to the *Plutus* to *Ἀριστῶνυμος*. The date of the latter would be entirely suitable. The name of Aristomenes is corrupted four times in ancient authors to Aristophanes, and the similarity of names may have led to a similar corruption in the didascalic notice. The comedy *Admetus* is known only from this notice. It may also be suggested as a possibility that the name of Theopompus, who was the author of a play *Admetus*, was displaced in some way by that of Aristomenes.

*Antiphanes.*—The chronology of Antiphanes has always been a perplexing problem. The accepted view is that of Clinton (*Phil. Mus.* 1, 1832, pp. 607 sqq.), that he was born in the ninety-third Olympiad (408–5), began to exhibit in the ninety-eighth (388–5), and died between 334 and 331. This result is derived from Suidas, who says: *γένεονε κατὰ τὴν 57' ὀλυμπιάδα*, and that he died at the age of 74, and from Anonymous II *περὶ κωμῳδίας*, who reports that he began to exhibit *μετὰ τὴν 57' ὀλ.* But the further statement of the latter, that Antiphanes was admitted to Athenian citizenship on the proposal of Demosthenes, must be rejected as inconsistent with the other data, and the comedy *Παρεκδιδομένη*, or at least the fragment quoted by Athenaeus, in which Seleucus is referred to as *βασιλεύς*, must be attributed to another poet. Perhaps quite the most serious objection to this solution is the word *γένεονε* in Suidas. Rohde has shown by a most careful analysis of all passages in Suidas in which this word occurs (*Rhein. Mus.* 33, 1878, pp. 161–220), that, out of 129 instances,

<sup>1</sup> *Rhein. Mus.* 34, 1879, 292 sqq. Thinking that this inscription was a portion of the Dionysiac catalogue, he had no datable event from which to reckon, for he did not trust the notice of the victory of Ameipsias at the Dionysia of 414.

the meaning 'natus est' is certain in only 6, among which he includes the reference to Antiphanes. In the overwhelming majority of cases *γέγονε* is equivalent to *ἤκμαζε*. Meineke found the greatest difficulty in the reference to Seleucus, and was disposed to correct *οδ'* to *ρδ'* in Suidas, thus prolonging the poet's life to ca. 304. But this proposal, involving a dramatic career of 84 years, has naturally met with no favor.

The Lenaeon list of victors, unfortunately, does not furnish us with new facts of a sufficiently definite character to settle, once for all, the difficulties which have been pointed out. After the victory of Cephisodotus in 402 we know of only one Lenaeon victory, that of Philemon in 306, which was not his first victory. We shall, consequently, have no absolutely certain point of departure, but shall be obliged to employ chronological data of a more general character. Our results will of necessity be only approximate and relative; and yet they may at least indicate roughly the position which Antiphanes held in relation to his contemporaries among the comic poets, and thus point to the true source of the contradictions in our evidence.

We have information about two of the contemporaries of Antiphanes—Anaxandrides and Eubulus. The first City victory of the former was won in 376, according to the Parian Chronicle.<sup>1</sup> The strange statement of Suidas: *γεγονώς ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσι Φιλίππου τοῦ Μακεδόνα*, δλ. *ρα'*, is at least not at variance with the Chronicle. Eubulus, according to Suidas, flourished in the 101st Olympiad, 376-3. These data have reference, no doubt, to the Dionysia, so that it is quite possible that both Anaxandrides and Eubulus were successful at the Lenaea before 376. Now in the Lenaeon list we find these names: Anaxandrides, Philetaerus, Eubulus, Ehippus, Antiphanes. The position of the names of Anaxandrides and Eubulus close to each other is in harmony with the evidence which we have just examined. But if Antiphanes began to exhibit as early as 388-5, it is surprising that we should find his name in the list four lines after that of Anaxandrides. We may

<sup>1</sup> L. 82: *ἀφ' οὗ Ἀναξανδρίδης ὁ κωμ[ωδοποιὸς] πρῶτον ἐνίκησεν, ἐτη ΠΔΙΙΙ, ἀρχοντος* Ἀθήνησιν Καλλέου. There can be no doubt that this is the correct restoration. Bergk, *Litt. Gesch.* IV, p. 158, insisted that this must be a dithyrambic victory, relying on his interpretation of CIG., Sic. et Ital. 1098, and pointing to the fact that the Chronicle never refers to comic victories. The newly discovered fragment corrects this assumption. His interpretation of the didascalie inscription can not be defended. The epithet *κωμωδοποιός* is decisive.

estimate the discrepancy at from 15 to 20 years. It is of course possible that, for some reason, his first success at the Lenaea was delayed this long. One might refer to the case of Cratinus, who seems to have won a victory at the Dionysia about 10 years before he was successful at the Lenaea, and to Philemon, whose first Lenaeon victory was some seven years after his first City victory. And yet both Cratinus and Philemon seem to have reserved their strength for the City Dionysia, at which they won a large majority of their victories. Antiphanes, on the other hand, won 8 of his 13 victories at the Lenaea, whereas Anaxandrides was victorious only three times at the Lenaea, but seven times at the Dionysia. Thus every consideration seems to point to a later date for the first appearance of Antiphanes than that given by Anonymous.

We reach the same general result by another method, keeping entirely to our list of victors. Between the victory of Cephisodotus in 402 and that of Menander, which can scarcely have been later than 321, is an interval of 81 years. Our catalogues gave the names of 28 poets in this period. Some of the victories after 402 were undoubtedly won by predecessors of Cephisodotus. We may estimate the number at 10,<sup>1</sup> leaving 71 victories, or an average of about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  victories for each poet. Assuming that this average was constant, the first victory of Antiphanes would fall in the year 367. This result tallies with that which we have already obtained. Anonymous places the date of Antiphanes' entrance upon his dramatic career about 20 years too high.

There is no trustworthy indication of a date anterior to 367 in the extant fragments.<sup>2</sup> Meineke thought that the *Ἀντρεία*, in which the perfumer Pero was mentioned, should be dated ca. 376, for this person was mentioned also in the *Admetus* of Theopompus, produced in 387, and in a play of Anaxandrides of uncertain date. For a similar reason he placed the *Ὀμφάλη* in the same period, because the baker Theario, whom Aristophanes mentioned in two

<sup>1</sup> This seems liberal enough, considering the small number of victories assigned to the immediate predecessors of Cephisodotus. The result which we shall reach, however, would not be affected at all if a lower or higher estimate were adopted.

<sup>2</sup> The earliest play that can be dated positively has been thought to be the *Ἀνασφίζόμενοι*, on the strength of CIA. II 972. But I have shown elsewhere that the archon Diotimus of this inscription was the magistrate of 289/8, and not of 354/3, as Boeckh and Koehler thought. See *Am. Jour. Arch.*, vol. IV, No. 1.

of his later plays, is referred to. But no reliance can be placed in such evidence.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, the *Κιθαριστής* must have been produced after the defeat of Agis by Antipater in 330, and the *Δίδυμοι* still later, if frag. 81 is to receive a natural interpretation. Quite apart, therefore, from the *Παρεκδιδομένη*, to which we shall return, there is good reason for believing that Antiphanes can not have died as early as 331. We are accordingly bound to follow up the indications, which we have found in the catalogue of victors, of a date later than that furnished by Anonymous, and to seek an explanation of the error in the tradition.

In the first place, we should give the word *γέγονε* in Suidas its usual and proper meaning of 'floruit,' and adopt Bernhardt's<sup>2</sup> correction of *ϡγ'* to *ργ'* (368-5). The *floruit* of the dramatic poets was readily fixed by the ancients by reference to the pinacographical material and official documents which formed the basis of Aristotle's *Διδασκαλίας* and *Νίκαι Διονυσιακαί καὶ Αθηναϊκαί*. The peripatetics studied these sources diligently. The valuable article of Anonymous II *περὶ κωμῳδίας* is largely compiled from such documents. It is significant that in it the vague *γέγονε* occurs only once, and that in the notice on Epicharmus, concerning whom no didascalic information was available. Elsewhere we find the more definite *νικᾷ* or *πρώτον ἐδίδαξε*. The same holds true of the Parian Chronicle. Now there can be no doubt that *γέγονε* and *ἦν* in Suidas, as well as the *ἐγνωρίζετο* of the chronographers, were but a convenient equivalent of *πρώτον ἐδίδαξε* or *ἐνίκα*. *γέγονε* then designated not the real acme, but what Kaibel terms the "half acme." From this as a starting-point it was easy for the ancient biographer to arrive at an approximate date for the birth of the poet, assisted often, no doubt, by allusions in his earlier dramas; for the birth-date was of course not a matter of record.<sup>3</sup> The accounts of Anonymous and Suidas go back, therefore, to a common source, and, where they give information on the same point, should be in agreement. If the correct form of the state-

<sup>1</sup> We do not know how long Pero lived. As for Theario, the allusion in the *Ὁμόφλη* (frag. 176, K.) would be just as much in point if the baker had been dead for years.

<sup>2</sup> Bernhardt, however, took *γέγονε* to mean 'natus est.'

<sup>3</sup> See Kaibel on Menander, in CIG., Sic. et Ital. 1184, and in his notices on the comic poets in Pauly-Wissowa. The statements about the youth of Eupolis and Menander at their first exhibitions were probably derived from their plays.

ment in Suidas was γέγονε κατὰ τὴν ργ' ὀλ., the parallel statement in Anonymous was originally ἤρξατο διδάσκειν κατὰ τὴν ργ' ὀλ.

The notice as it now stands in Anonymous is as follows: 'Ἀντιφάνης μὲν οὖν Στεφάνου Ἀθηναῖος (*lacuna*) καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν μετὰ (κατὰ Mein.) τὴν Ση' ὀλυμπιάδα. καὶ φασὶν αὐτὸν γενέσθαι μὲν τῶν ἀπὸ Θεσσαλίας ἐκ Δαρίσσης, παρεγγραφῆναι δὲ εἰς τὴν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείαν ὑπὸ Δημοσθένους, κτέ. Kaibel points out the *lacuna* before καί. It seems to me probable that the lost sentence gave the date of the poet's birth and read: 'Ἀντιφάνης . . . . ἐγενήθη ἐπὶ τῆς Ση' ὀλυμπιάδος καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν κατὰ τὴν ργ' ὀλ. κτέ. If the original notice was in this form, it is easy to see how both the *lacuna* and the false date of the first appearance had their origin, and also how the corruption in Suidas arose.

Without going into the difficult question about the poet's birth-place, we now learn that the statement that Demosthenes made the proposal granting Athenian citizenship is chronologically quite possible. The date of his death may now be placed as late as 310. But the *Παρεκδιδομένη*, as we have seen, is generally placed after 307/6, on the authority of Diodorus 20, 53, who states that the title of βασιλεύς was not officially assumed by Seleucus until after it had been adopted by Antigonus. We know, however, that this title and its dignities were commonly bestowed upon this king by his subjects some time before they had been officially adopted for foreign intercourse.<sup>1</sup> There is no reason why the phrase τὴν Σελεύκου τοῦ βασιλέως ὑπεροχὴν (frag. 187, K.) should not have been employed by a comic poet to indicate the actual position of the ruler without regard to diplomatic usage. We are accordingly no longer obliged to suppose that Athenaeus wrongly attributed this play to Antiphanes or that the present text of the quotation is due to a later edition of the play. If Antiphanes was born in Ol. 98 (388-5), first exhibited in Ol. 103 (368-5), and died at the age of 74 years between 314/3 and 311/0, the internal evidence of the extant fragments is fully satisfied, the chronological data supplied by the list of victors and the Parian Chronicle are given their due weight, and the present text of Suidas and Anonymous, universally admitted to be corrupt, receives a satisfactory explanation.

<sup>1</sup> Droysen, *Gesch. des Hellenismus*, II 2, p. 141: "Bisher schon war Seleukos von den Barbaren König genannt und in morgenländischen Weise begrüsst worden."

*Alexis*.—Any new light on the life of Alexis, the greatest of the poets of the Middle Comedy, is peculiarly welcome. The notice which was once in Anonymus is now lost, and Suidas gives no chronological data. A victory at the Dionysia of 347 is recorded in CIA. II 971 g. The Ἀγκυλίων must have been produced before this time, for the verses preserved by Diogenes refer to Plato as still alive. The Ἀποβάτης was one of his earliest plays. On account of the reference to the poet Argas (fr. 19), who is mentioned also by Anaxandrides, Kock concludes that it was written ca. 468, but Kaibel is clearly right in objecting to this conclusion.<sup>1</sup> We are certainly safe in saying that none of the plays of which we have fragments need have been written before 350. On the other hand, a *terminus post quem* for his death is furnished by the fragment of the Ὑποβολιμαῖος, in which the poet refers to Arsinoë, the sister-wife of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and to the treaty between Athens, Sparta, and Egypt whereby peace was re-established. The second marriage of Ptolemy was contracted before 273, and the treaty concluded somewhere between 271 and 265.<sup>2</sup> Kaibel accordingly dates this play ca. 270.<sup>3</sup> If Plutarch, Script. Mor. 420 d, is interpreted literally, Alexis lived to be 106 years old. The date of his birth may accordingly be placed as early as 376.

In the Lenaeon list of victors the name of Alexis is four lines after that of Antiphanes, who, as we have seen, did not begin to exhibit until about 467. Accordingly, the first Lenaeon victory of Alexis may be placed about ten years later. This date, which of course can be considered only an approximation, is entirely in harmony with the known facts of his life as indicated above, and confirms the view of Kaibel that the date of the poet's birth as established by Meineke is much too early. Doubt may still be felt as to the authorship of the present version of the Ὑποβολιμαῖος, but at any rate it is possible that it was written by the centenarian. The Ἀρθίδες was in all probability produced as late as 275, as I have tried to prove on the strength of CIA. II 975 h (Am. Jour. Arch. IV 1).

<sup>1</sup> See article in Pauly-Wissowa. Kock refers to Meineke, who, however, merely places the floruit of Argas ca. 368.

<sup>2</sup> Köhler on CIA. II 332. On the marriage see Mahaffy, Empire of the Ptolemies, p. 138.

<sup>3</sup> Bergk, Rhein. Mus. 35, p. 259, contends that the present text is due to a second edition of the play. But, as Kaibel has shown, the date of the poet's birth has been placed too early by Meineke (i. e. ca. 291). See Hist. Crit., p. 376.

The fact that Alexis was active as a playwright ca. 357 suggests an interesting coincidence, which, I trust, may be found to be not without some claims to probability. In the Parian Chronicle, 90-91, after an extensive lacuna, are the words: ἐνίκησεν, ἔτη ΠΔΔΔΙΙΙ, ἄρχοντας Ἀθήνησιν Ἀγαθοκλέ[ους], i. e. in the year 357/6. The reference undoubtedly was to the first victory of some poet at the Dionysia. Now what poet could this be but Alexis? We know certainly of no tragic poet of prominence whose success in 356 could be thus signalled. Of the comic poets, Anaxandrides' first victory has already been mentioned, and that of Antiphanes was doubtless about a decade earlier. Of the other poets of the Middle Comedy, none but Alexis was of sufficient prominence to have been selected by the compiler of the Chronicle for special mention, which is accorded, apparently, to none of the poets of the New Comedy except Philemon and Menander. It is of course possible that the poet was a dithyrambic poet; but against this suggestion is to be urged the distinguished position which Alexis held in Athens during an exceptionally long career. I would accordingly propose the following restoration: [. . . . καὶ Ἀλεξίς ὁ κωμοειδοποιὸς<sup>1</sup> τότε πρωῶτον] ἐνίκησεν.

*Menander.*—In his commentary on the newly discovered fragment of the Parian Chronicle (Ath. Mitth. 22, 1897, p. 200), Wilhelm calls attention to the significant fact that Menander precedes Philemon in the catalogue of victors, but he offers no explanation. As our study of the victors' catalogues has shown, the explanation is simply this: the catalogue which we possess is the Lenaeon list, whereas the ancient authorities who place Philemon before Menander take into account only the events of the City Dionysia. We can not, however, place the first Lenaeon victory of Menander before 321, because the date of his birth<sup>2</sup> is given by CIG., Sic. et Ital. 1182, as 342/1; nor much later, because it is unlikely that the first Lenaeon victory of Philemon was gained more than six or seven years after his first City victory in 327. As regards the contradiction in the ancient notices concerning the date of the first City victory of Menander, Wilhelm rightly says that it was due to the confusion of two separate events—his first appearance in 321, in the archonship of Philocles, and his first victory in 315, under Democleides. I

<sup>1</sup> For the spelling cf. the new fragment of the Chronicle.

<sup>2</sup> Although this may be, as Kaibel believes, only the result of an estimate on the basis of the date of his first appearance.



think that the amalgamation of the two notices can be traced to its origin.

The chronographers mention the first competition of only one other dramatic poet. Under Ol. 77<sup>2</sup> the Armenian Version of Eusebius says: Sophocles . . . primum apparuit (Sync.: *πρῶτος ἐπεδείξατο*, Hieron.: primum . . . opera publicauit). Then under Ol. 78<sup>1</sup> the first victory of the same poet is indicated by the word *cognoscebatur* (Hieron.: *clarus habetur*).<sup>1</sup> As regards Menander, Hieronymus gives under Ol. 114<sup>4</sup>: Menander primam fabulam cognomento *Orgen* docens superat.<sup>2</sup> The language of Syncellus is: *πρῶτον δρᾶμα διδάξας ἐνίκα*. Now just as the notice of Sophocles' first appearance is followed by another recording his first victory (unless we accept Plutarch's statement that Sophocles won at his first competition), so we should naturally expect to find in the chronographers under Ol. 116<sup>2</sup> (316/5) a reference to Menander's first victory. In fact, there seems to be a trace of such a notice in Eusebius, though only a trace. The Armenian Version contains this: Menander et Speusippus philosophi cognoscebantur. In Hieronymus, under the same date, we find: Menedemus et Speusippus filosofi insignes habentur, and similar in Syncellus. Before we had the testimony of the Parian Chronicle to a victory of Menander in 315, it was natural to regard the word *Menander* in Eusebius as a corruption of *Menedemus*. It will now, however, seem more probable that Menander belongs here, the rest of the sentence being lost. I believe that the combination of the two notices can most readily be explained if we assume that the second notice ran thus: *Μένανδρος <κωμικός πρῶτον, δρᾶμα διδάξας Ὀργήν, ἐνίκα, καὶ Μενέδημος> καὶ Σπεύσιππος οἱ φιλοσοφοὶ ἐγνωρίζοντο*. The preceding notice employed the words *πρῶτον ἐδίδαξε*. Now the first person who falsely construed *πρῶτον* with *δρᾶμα* (cf. Hieron.: *primam fabulam*) or with *διδάξας* would be tempted at once to substitute the second notice for the first. For this reason I think it more probable that the *Ὀργή* was produced in 315 than, with Wilhelm, in 321.

EDWARD CAPPS.

<sup>1</sup> Euripides is wrongly included in the notice. The date should be 77<sup>4</sup> (469/8) instead of 78<sup>1</sup>, for Aeschylus won in this year. Plutarch, *Cim.* 8, makes Sophocles victorious at his first competition in 468. According to the Parian Chronicle he was 28 years old in 468, so that there is nothing improbable, at least, in the notice of Eusebius.

<sup>2</sup> Curiously corrupt in the Vers. Arm.: *Iéndrus primus uirtutem ostendit, superabat enim ὀργήν* (iracundiam).